



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,712	01/14/2000	Tongbi Jiang	3815US (98-0670)	8743
7590	03/18/2003		EXAMINER	
Joseph A Walkowski TRASK BRITT & ROSSA P O Box 2550 Salt Lake City, UT 84110			WARREN, MATTHEW E	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2815		
DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JAN

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/483,712	JIANG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit
	Matthew E. Warren	2815

--The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r sheet with the correspondenc address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
 2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
 (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
 (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
 6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
 7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.


The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_   
 10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

EDDIE LEE  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The applicant primarily argues that the bond wires of Lee cannot be combined with Farnsworth. The examiner believes that Lee can be combined with Farnsworth for the reasons stated in the rejection. The examiner also believes that the arguments against the combination are irrelevant because bond wires are not the suggested novelty of the invention. The novelty, as stated in the applicant's SUMMARY of the INVENTION, is the pattern of discrete conductive elements protruding from encapsulant material. In fact, the applicant's own prior art figure shows all of the elements of the claims (including bond wires) except the discrete conductive elements protruding from the encapsulant material. From the arguments, it seems that the applicant is basing the patentability of the instant invention on bond wires. However, bond wires are well known in the art to be used with LOC packages, the applicant's prior art discloses those bond wires, and the cited references teach those bond wires and show proper motivation for combining. The bond wires of the instant invention are not distinguishable over the cited art and the rejection is still proper..